

NORTH OGDEN PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

May 15, 2013

The North Ogden Planning Commission convened in a regular meeting on May 15, 2013 at 6:30 pm in the North Ogden City Municipal Building, 505 E. 2600 N. North Ogden, Utah. Notice of time, place and agenda of the meeting was furnished to each member of the Planning Commission, posted on the bulletin board at the municipal office and posted to the Utah State Website on May 14, 2013. Notice of the annual meeting schedule was published in the Standard-Examiner on December 30, 2012.

COMMISSIONERS:

Larry Residori	Chairman
Allan Dalpiaz	Vice-Chairman
Joan Brown	Commissioner
Steve Quinney	Commissioner
Eric Thomas	Commissioner

STAFF:

Craig Barker	Community Development Director
Jon Call	City Attorney
Gary Kerr	Building Official
Annette Spendlove	HR Director/City Recorder

EXCUSED:

Blake Knight	Commissioner
Dee Russell	Commissioner

VISITORS:

Norman Schmell	Susan Schmell	Larry Goodwin
Andrew Young	Jolyon Walker	Bruce Jones
Whitney Mason	Bob Anderson	Melissa Virgin
Bruce Taylor	Jill Taylor	Carson Jones
Brent Pectol	Shara Ballstaedt	

REGULAR MEETING

Chairman Residori called the regular meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Vice-Chairman Dalpiaz offered the invocation and led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. CONSIDERATION AND/OR ACTION TO APPROVE THE MAY 1, 2013 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES.

Commissioner Brown made a motion to approve the May 1, 2013 Planning Commission meeting minutes. Vice-Chairman Dalpias seconded the motion.

Voting on the motion:

Chairman Residori	yes
Vice-Chairman Dalpias	yes
Commissioner Brown	yes
Commissioner Quinney	yes
Commissioner Thomas	yes

The motion passed unanimously.

ACTIVE AGENDA

1. PUBLIC COMMENTS.

Jolyon Walker, 3603 North Kinghill Drive, stated that the comments requested by Community Development Director Craig Barker were not considered at the May 1 meeting because they were not specific regarding date and time. He stated during that meeting it was suggested that concerned neighbors observe in order to be more specific with their comments regarding a home occupation. He noted that based on that suggestion he took some action; he sat in front of Mr. Bagley's home on Tuesday afternoon and that created an uproar, so his question to the Planning Commission is if he should continue to do that in order to get specific example of violations of the conditional use permit and City ordinance. He stated he has had two complaints of harassment filed against him and he has had the police visit him as a result.

Mr. Barker suggested the Planning Commission refer those comments to City Attorney Jon Call. He stated he knows the City is studying the issue, but is not sure the Planning Commission is prepared to respond at this time. Mr. Call added that the public comment portion of a meeting is not a question and answer session. He stated that relative to getting specific information in complaints, any method that is within the law is perfectly fine for someone to carry out. He stated he does not know why complaints have been filed and he has not heard anything about them. Mr. Walker stated that last Friday he met with Mayor Harris and City Manager Ron Chandler and during that meeting he was informed that harassment claims had been filed against him and he asked for clarification as to whether what he was doing had actually risen to the level of harassment and he has not yet received an answer. Mr. Barker stated that Mr. Walker will receive an answer, but that answer will likely not come from the Planning Commission.

2. CONSIDERATION TO AMEND VALLEY VIEW SUBDIVISION PLAT.

A staff memo from Community Development Director Barker explained the developers of Valley View Estates Subdivision, located approximately at 3625 North and 500 East, are proposing to amend the notes on the existing plat to eliminate the “R” Lot designation which has been approved by the Fire District Fire Marshall by recording a new Plat.

Mr. Barker reviewed his staff memo and noted the Planning Commission has been provided with a copy of the report from the Fire Marshall with regard to water pressure in the subdivision and the fire service needs to be relative to the size of the homes in the development. He stated that as a result of some investigation and fire code changes that occurred a few years ago it can be necessary for homeowners in homes of a certain size to install a fire sprinkler system. He noted the plat contains notes regarding various items in the development and note number two indicates “Lots marked with an “R” are restricted; homes on these lots must have a City approved interior fire sprinkler protection system. Available culinary water system pressure is minimal and interior plumbing lines must be enlarged to preserve pressure per the applicable plumbing code.” Mr. Barker noted the developer has worked with the Fire Marshall and his report has been provided to the Planning Commission.

Vice-Chairman Dalpiaz asked why that language was originally put on the plat. Mr. Barker stated it was due to the lack of adequate water pressure in the area. Vice-Chairman Dalpiaz asked if the water pressure was actually measured and deemed inadequate at one time. Mr. Barker answered yes; at the time that the City Engineer evaluated the culinary water system, he calculated the pressure levels that would be delivered at the site and when the plat was recorded the City Engineer felt there was not adequate pressure and he required every home to have a fire sprinkler system in its design. He stated the subdivision is completely constructed and the developer has worked with the Fire Marshall; the developer is now recommending an amendment to the plat by adding a note that states “in accordance with Appendix B of the International Fire Code, lots marked with an “R” are restricted as follows: the proposed homes or dwellings on these lots that exceed 3,600 total square feet, including basements but excluding attached or detached garage areas, must be provided with an interior fire suppression sprinkler system.” Mr. Barker stated the note will also state “interior pipes must be enlarged sufficiently to preserve service pressure in the home or dwelling per the applicable plumbing code. Proposed homes or dwellings, which will have a total of 3,600 square feet or less are not required to be provided with interior fire suppression sprinkler systems; however, internal plumbing pipe must be enlarged sufficiently to preserve the pressure in the home.” He stated these changes are based on the fact that it is now possible to measure the exact water pressure in the development due to the fact that all infrastructure has been installed. He stated that based on the information that has been provided by the Fire Marshall, he is comfortable recommending approval of the plat amendment. He then reviewed the process for executing the amended plat.

Vice-Chairman Dalpiaz asked if the City Engineer must sign the amended plat. Mr. Barker answered yes and stated he signs all City plats because he is responsible for reviewing improvement plans and the cost of the improvements to ensure the City is able to secure a sufficient bond. He stated the City Engineer is an integral part of the subdivision approval process.

Vice-Chairman Dalpías stated there was a question about the area north of the subdivision and the feasibility of servicing an additional lot. Mr. Barker stated there are some dead-end lines in the area and the City has been working for a long time to make connections to the west of the subdivision that will significantly improve the water circulation system in the area, but until that happens there may not be many possibilities to develop the area north of the subdivision.

Jill Taylor, Spanish Fork, Utah, stated the requirement for fire sprinkler systems was added at the tail end of the subdivision approval process. She stated she had never seen a water test to inform her of the pressure levels in the area. She stated that last year there was a purchase offer for one of the lots and as soon as the buyer found they needed to install a sprinkler system, which increases construction costs by approximately \$10,000, they backed out of the deal. She stated she began to realize this would be a real problem, but she still did not know what the water pressure was and what the City's requirements were. She stated she contacted the Fire Marshall and he explained a new test could be done to determine the pressure and he explained that if water pressure was high enough the sprinkler systems would not be required. She stated that once the test was completed it was clear there was sufficient pressure for homes that were no larger than 3,600 square feet excluding the garage. She stated there is another pending offer on a lot in the development, but it is contingent on whether a fire system is required. She stated that it is clear that there is sufficient water pressure at the site and there should not be a requirement for every home to have a fire suppression system. She stated that is the reason for her request.

Commissioner Brown stated this is not the first time this issue has been raised. Mr. Barker stated that is correct; this issue comes up on a regular basis due to fire code changes that took place a few years ago. He stated nearly every subdivision is evaluated to determine water pressure and the maximum size of a dwelling that can be built on particular lot sizes.

Commissioner Thomas stated that the report from the Fire Marshall actually references dwellings 3,500 square feet or larger, but the note on the plat says 3,600 square feet. Ms. Taylor stated that she thought the fire code actually says 3,600 square feet. Mr. Barker stated he will follow-up with the Fire Marshall and clarify that issue.

Commissioner Thomas made a motion to accept the Valley View Subdivision amended plat by accepting the note to reflect the report from the Fire Marshall regarding dwelling size in relation to the requirement for a fire sprinkler system. Commissioner Brown seconded the motion.

Voting on the motion:

Chairman Residori	yes
Vice-Chairman Dalpías	yes
Commissioner Brown	yes
Commissioner Quinney	yes
Commissioner Thomas	yes

The motion passed unanimously.

3. CONSIDERATION TO APPROVE A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR A TEMPORARY BUSINESS TO SELL FIREWORKS AT APPROXIMATELY 1956 N. 400 E.

A staff memo from Community Development Director Barker explained the sale of fireworks is a Conditional Use Permit which requires approval by the Planning Commission. The King's parking lot is a cooperative effort among the owners of the buildings that comprise this area. I believe there are six owners of this shopping center area. There are cooperative agreements to use the common parking area. The representative of the fireworks business has said that they have approval to locate on the property where they are going to locate in the King's parking lot. The staff believes there is a management group or individual for this shopping center. The City requires that we have a letter of some type on file from the property owner or his agent allowing the temporary business to use the site. The staff has also required that the Fire District's Fire Marshall review and inform the Planning Commission of any requirements it might have. The Police Department should also be contacted for any comment. Staff recommends approval of this CUP once the above requirements have been met.

Mr. Barker reviewed his staff memo.

Chairman Residori stated that a lot of people park close to the new Pizza Pie Café and he agreed it is important for the firework stand owner to get permission from the property owners to locate his stand there. Mr. Barker agreed. He stated there are six different parcels and property owner at the site, but they all have a cooperative agreement regarding use of the common parking area.

Vice-Chairman Dalpiaz made a motion to approve a conditional use permit for a temporary business to sell fireworks at approximately 1956 North 400 East subject to Fire Marshall's approval. Commissioner Brown seconded the motion.

Voting on the motion:

Chairman Residori	yes
Vice-Chairman Dalpiaz	yes
Commissioner Brown	yes
Commissioner Quinney	yes
Commissioner Thomas	yes

The motion passed unanimously.

4. CONSIDERATION TO APPROVE A NEW STORAGE BUILDING FOR BEN LOMOND CEMETERY, LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 526 E. 2850 N.

A staff memo from Community Development Director Barker explained the Ben Lomond Cemetery District is proposing to tear down their existing equipment building and build a new one for equipment and supply storage. The building will be approximately 1200 square feet. The cemetery is in a Residential R-1-8AG Zone which requires that an accessory building of this size be located 15 feet from the property line. However, if the parcel is larger than one acre, the

Planning Commission may allow the building to be closer to the property line. It is recommended by staff that the Planning Commission allow this building to be closer than 15 feet to the property line.

Mr. Barker reviewed his memo and noted staff recommends approval of the conditional use permit. He noted the City has notified people living within 300 feet of the proposed development and he only received one phone call from a person asking a few questions about the project, but they did not have any objection to it. He closed his comments by reviewing a rendering of the building.

Vice-Chairman Dalpiaz stated it appears that the existing building extends to the property line. Andrew Young stated he is the Sexton for the Ben Lomond Cemetery and he explained the existing building is located one foot from the property line and the proposal is to locate the new building six feet from the property line. He reviewed a map of the cemetery and identified the proposed location of the new building.

Chairman Residori stated his only concern is whether the new building will block anyone's view. Mr. Young stated he does not think that will be the case because it will be blocked by existing mature trees that border residential properties.

Vice-Chairman Dalpiaz inquired as to the proposed height of the new building. Commissioner Thomas stated the packet materials explain the building will be 12 feet in height.

Commissioner Thomas made a motion to approve a new storage building for Ben Lomond Cemetery, located at approximately 526 E 2850 N. Commissioner Brown seconded the motion.

Voting on the motion:

Chairman Residori	yes
Vice-Chairman Dalpiaz	yes
Commissioner Brown	yes
Commissioner Quinney	yes
Commissioner Thomas	yes

The motion passed unanimously.

5. CONSIDERATION TO APPROVE A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR A NEW SIGN FOR BACH SELF STORAGE, LOCATED APPROXIMATELY AT 2197 N 400 E.

A staff memo from Community Development Director Barker explained the owners of Bach Self Storage have submitted a Conditional Use Permit application for a new sign. This sign does not really meet any of the City's sign classifications. It comes closest to being a unique sign in staff's opinion, since it has both elements of a monument sign and a pole sign. The sign needs to allow

for adequate site lines as a car exits the drive from the storage facility to Washington Boulevard. Staff recommends approval of this CUP application.

Mr. Barker reviewed his staff memo. He stated the City has five different sign types specified in the City ordinance and he reviewed those categories. He stated that this is a unique sign that fits most closely in the pole sign category. He noted the applicant wants to remove their existing sign and add a reader board to the new sign. He stated it is a unique sign, but staff does not find any issues with approving the sign as long as a conditional use permit is granted by the Planning Commission. He stated the City notified surrounding property owners of the application and he did not receive any feedback.

Jay Bingham, Allied Electric Sign, stated his company has been contracted to perform the sign work.

Vice-Chairman Dalpiaz asked if the top portion of the sign is permanent with a reader board on the bottom or if the bottom is permanent with a reader board on the top. Mr. Bingham stated that the portion that says "Bach Self Storage" is permanent and the lettering on that portion of the sign will not change. He stated the portion directly under that is an electronic message sign.

Chairman Residori asked if the sign will be the same as the current sign. Mr. Bingham stated the current sign seems to get lost in traffic and it will be removed and used at another site owned by the same company. He stated it is necessary to try to elevate the sign somewhat and he has worked on a design that would fit the City's criteria as closely as possible. He stated the sign is not more than 20-feet in height.

Commissioner Quinney made a motion to approve a conditional use permit for a new sign for back self-storage, located at approximately 2197 N. 400 E. Vice-Chairman Dalpiaz seconded the motion.

Voting on the motion:

Chairman Residori	yes
Vice-Chairman Dalpiaz	yes
Commissioner Brown	yes
Commissioner Quinney	yes
Commissioner Thomas	yes

The motion passed unanimously.

Vice-Chairman Dalpiaz made a motion to amend the order of the agenda by hearing item seven prior to item six. Commissioner Brown seconded the motion.

Voting on the motion:

Chairman Residori	yes
Vice-Chairman Dalpiaz	yes
Commissioner Brown	yes
Commissioner Quinney	yes

Commissioner Thomas yes

The motion passed unanimously.

**7. CONSIDERATION TO APPROVE HALL TREE PHASE XIV FINAL PLAT,
LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 2850 N 1450 E.**

A staff memo from Community Development Director Barker explained Hall Tree Subdivision was granted preliminary approval on April 17, 2013. The most significant issue has been the storm water control system for this and other Hall Tree subdivisions. At one time the former gravel pit adjacent to this phase was going to be used as a regional storm water basin. This has, however, changed and the gravel pit area will be used only for onsite detention for the Hall Tree Subdivisions that can be drained to this area. The City Engineer has sent his final approval letter with his comments and requirements for final approval. The preliminary approval by the Planning Commission also has items to be completed such as letters from utility companies, especially from Pineview Water. The staff recommends final approval subject to the City Engineer's letter

Mr. Barker reviewed his staff memo. He noted the design of the storm water retention system will meet the needs of the development and explained how storm water system requirements are determined in order to prevent flooding of homes. He stated there are a number of issues that the developer must address prior to final approval and he identified a few of those issues. He stated the requirements must be met before the City will agree to record the development plat.

Carson Jones stated he is the developer of the property. He stated there is a plan, design, and construction drawings for the storm water retention in the gravel pit, but he is still working on another potential option of piping the water directly to Wadman Park in order to bypass the gravel pit. He stated he will present that issue to the City Council, but he would like to receive Planning Commission approval of the project tonight based on the design he has presented and if the Wadman Park aspect of the project is not approved he will proceed with the design included on the plat.

Vice-Chairman Dalpias made a motion to approve Hall Tree Phase XIV final plat, located at approximately 2850 N 1450 E, subject to meeting all conditions set forth in the City Engineer's letter. Commissioner Brown seconded the motion.

Voting on the motion:

Chairman Residori	yes
Vice-Chairman Dalpias	yes
Commissioner Brown	yes
Commissioner Quinney	yes
Commissioner Thomas	yes

The motion passed unanimously.

6. CREATION OF A NEW ZONE CHAPTER, “MASTER PLANNED COMMUNITY”.

A staff memo from Community Development Director Barker explained the developers of the North Ogden Cove have proposed that the City adopt a new zoning chapter which may be applied to only large scale developments, say 100 acres or larger, which will set the development criteria for a long period of time. The City and the developer work together and create a detailed development agreement to determine the uses, standards and other criteria for the long term development of a large parcel. This type of zoning and development agreement gives the City and developer a long term development and design agreement. These types of zoning agreements exist in other jurisdictions and the North Ogden Cove developers feel this is a good thing for the city as well as meeting their development objectives. There can be advantages and disadvantages to this type of zoning arrangement. Staff has provided a copy of one such zoning chapter for the Planning Commission's review and consideration.

Mr. Barker reviewed his staff memo. He stated the Planning Commission is not being asked to take action on this issue this evening. He noted the key to this type of development is the development agreement and the development of a long term plan.

City Attorney Call explained that to his knowledge there is only one other city, Pleasant View, who has adopted this particular ordinance; it was written by Bruce Baird, an attorney, and Jody Burnett, who is the leading city litigator in the State of Utah. He stated the ordinance would essentially create an overlay zone; the underlying base zone would remain in existence and a development agreement modifies that zone. He stated this provides some flexibility and another tool that the City and developers can use for large developments in order to allow for more open space or cluster developments. He stated one issue associated with development agreements is the idea that the City cannot illegally delegate legislative power and the zoning language basically states there is a legislative purpose behind the idea of these large scale developments similar to Daybreak; it is part of the City's purpose to allow developers to develop larger portions of ground at one time and lock in some terms of how the development will proceed in the future to provide stability.

Vice-Chairman Dalpiaz asked if The Cove development is larger than 100 acres. Mr. Barker answered yes. Mr. Call stated that the developer would like to apply this type of zoning to The North Cove; The Cove is already platted. Mr. Barker stated that is correct, but there is still a significant amount of property in The Cove. He stated there are other properties of significant size in the north and east portions of the City and many of them are subject to geologic hazards and conditions, which may render them questionable in terms of development. He stated he is not sure if there will be another area of the City that would meet the 100 acre requirement so he sees the use of this type of zoning as being fairly limited in the City. He stated a development agreement would set a lot of requirements in zone and land uses are fairly well spelled out in the language regarding the zone; the developer would be allowed to vary land uses as long as they negotiate those terms with the Planning Commission and the City prior to the development of the property. He stated that at one time there was some talk about developing neighborhood commercial uses at The Cove and the City denied that because the goal was to focus commercial development along Washington Boulevard from 2700 North to 1700 North. He stated a

developer may, in his developer agreement, talk about an overall base density, development of major streets, the development of a specified number of dwelling units, and a mix of residence types. He stated it is not unlike a planned residential development (PRD) in that consideration. He referenced the Wolf Creek development in Ogden Valley as an example of this type of development. He stated the Planning Commission, City Council, and developer would be required to work together to create a master development agreement for this type of development. He reiterated he is not convinced there will be many of this type of development in the City due to the 100 acre requirement, but he is happy to work on development of the language for such a zone for the Planning Commission to consider.

Vice-Chairman Dalpias stated legal counsel for Mr. Marriott attended a Planning Commission meeting recently and asked for this type of zoning and he asked Mr. Barker if he felt the draft zoning language would meet that request. Mr. Call stated that legal counsel is the person that wrote the draft language. Mr. Barker stated that he felt Mr. Marriott would like to enter into a development agreement because it would give him some various assurances. He reviewed some of the criteria that could be included in a development agreement, but noted everything would need to be negotiated and both parties would participate in those negotiations. He noted a development agreement can only be amended upon consent of the Planning Commission and the City Council and there are some questions as to whether a current Council can bind a future Council.

Chairman Residori stated that there have been discussions about updating the City's Master Plan, or at least a portion of it, and he asked if developing of this type of zoning would be considered in this process. Mr. Barker stated most entities require that a development plan be done in conjunction with the City's Master Plan or a comprehensive plan. Chairman Residori asked if the consultant working on the Master Plan would consider new zoning language. Mr. Barker stated the tentative budget has been passed and it includes \$75,000 to perform an update to the Master Plan, but that may not be enough money to update the entire Plan the way it should be done. He stated he is working with City Administration to determine what areas of the Plan the hired consultants should focus on and he highlighted a few sections of the Plan that would be updated. He stated that information will be brought to the Planning Commission in detail prior to the updates commencing. He then noted the draft ordinance notes that the new zoning would be developed in coordination with the City's General Plan for specified areas. He stated the property owned by Mr. Marriott is designated to be used for low density, single family homes or approximately four dwelling units per acre. He stated the property is 100 acres and once streets are installed on the property there will be approximately 80 acres available. He stated the City could tell Mr. Marriott he could build 320 homes on those 80 acres and ask him to provide a proposal for organizing those homes on the property; that could be done through development agreements that would require approval of the Planning Commission and the City Council. He then asked the Planning Commission if they would like him to continue to work on development of language for master planned community zoning.

Chairman Residori stated that he continues to be reminded of the Economic Development Committee discussing the land near 1700 North and not wanting to approve any type of development until the Master Plan is updated. He stated he is not sure the City Council would want to consider language for this type of zoning at this time. Mr. Barker stated that at the next

Planning Commission meeting he will provide a draft of mixed use zoning language for the body to review and consider.

Commissioner Thomas stated that he feels allowing this type of zoning language to be considered would provide for more meaningful updates to the Master Plan. Mr. Barker stated that may be correct because zoning is tied to the Master Plan as an implementation tool.

Vice-Chairman Dalpiaz stated he agrees with Commissioner Thomas that it would be appropriate to consider mixed use zoning and master planned community zoning so they can be tied in to the Master Plan. There was a consensus from all Planning Commissioners to direct staff to continue to work on zoning language for both types of zones.

8. PUBLIC COMMENTS.

Brent Pectol, 123 E 1875 N, asked if the type of zoning that was just discussed is the direction the City is heading relative to the property behind and around Country Boy Dairy. Commissioner Thomas stated the rezone request for that property was pulled from the agenda. Mr. Barker stated that is correct. He stated the applicant asked that the rezone not be considered until a mixed-use zone is created for the City. Commissioner Thomas informed Mr. Pectol that he did not miss any discussions about the issue, but he was welcome to comment on what he would like to see in that area. Mr. Pectol stated that as a homeowner in the area he does not want any more multi-family units; the area is already flooded with them and a large number of the existing condominiums are already listed for sale and he does not know how many more of those types of dwelling units are needed in the area. He stated that in his neighborhood along 1875 North there are several homes currently for sale and he feels that may be due to fear of the proposed development. He stated he does not want his property value to drop anymore because he is a homeowner in “condo-ville”.

Chairman Residori encouraged Mr. Pectol to review past minutes of the City Council and Economic Development Committee to gain an understanding of their feelings regarding the proposed development of the land.

Melissa Burgeon, 295 W 1825 N, stated she also lives in the area near Country Boy Dairy and she agrees with Mr. Pectol that there are so many for sale signs and there is already a sufficient number of townhomes and it is not necessary to add any more to the area. She stated she feels that all new development in the City seems to be in townhomes or high density housing and she referenced the corridor by Majestic Elementary School and the development behind the movie theater. She stated she does not feel there is a need for any more of those types of homes in the City. She stated she is very much in favor of providing affordable housing for everyone and she feels there is a sufficient number affordably priced homes in the City and she does not want any more of them in her neighborhood.

9. PLANNING COMMISSION/STAFF COMMENTS.

Chairman Residori asked if everyone is familiar with what they are supposed to be doing relative to email correspondence. City Recorder Spendlove explained that the Planning Commission members should be using their City-assigned email address for any City business. She stated Council packets will be emailed to the Planning Commissioner's City email address beginning with the next meeting packet.

Ms. Spendlove then stated the Planning Commission is required to receive annual training regarding the State of Utah Open and Public Meetings Act. She stated there is a class available through the Utah League of Cities and Towns (ULCT), but not all members of the Planning Commission have been able to attend that in the past. She stated she will schedule a training session for the body sometime in July. She then added the Planning Commission must adopt rules of order and procedure similar to the City Council. She stated staff will gather some examples of that type of document for the body to consider. Chairman Residori stated that the Planning Commission already has a set of rules and he will provide a copy to Ms. Spendlove.

10. ADJOURNMENT.

Commissioner Brown made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Vice-Chairman Dalpias seconded the motion.

Voting on the motion:

Chairman Residori	yes
Vice-Chairman Dalpias	yes
Commissioner Brown	yes
Commissioner Quinney	yes
Commissioner Thomas	yes

The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 7:45pm.

Planning Commission Chair

Annette Spendlove,
HR Director/City Recorder

Date approved